

REMARKS

Section 11 of the Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief states that “[a]pplicant argues that the Besaw reference fails to disclose retrieving all of the topology information before construction and plotting of a graph of the topology.” This is an incorrect reading of the argument presented in the previous Response. In contrast, Applicant argues that Besaw does disclose retrieving all of the topology information at once, as stated in the Advisory Action and in contrast with Claim 1. A portion of the previous Response is presented below in order to reiterate this point.

The sequence in which steps are recited in Claim 1 is important and should not be disregarded. Claim 1 recites that first topology information is retrieved from a data source, converted, and a graph of a first portion of the topology is displayed based on the converted first topology information. Then, after causing display of the graph of the first portion of the topology, second topology information is retrieved from the data source and a graph of (a) at least a portion of the first portion and (c) a second portion of the topology based on the second topology information, is displayed, without again retrieving the first topology information.

The Besaw references cannot be combined to make obvious the method steps recited in Claim 1, in the order in which the steps are performed in Claim 1. Besaw ‘789 describes retrieving all of the topology information (e.g., the various views according to the Office Action) before proceeding with construction and plotting of a graph that represents the corresponding topology. Besaw ‘789 does not teach retrieval and plotting of topology information, relative to the same topology, at different times and, therefore does not teach the incremental plotting technique recited in

Claim 1, in which only the portions of the topology information necessary

for plotting requested portions of the topology are retrieved in response to a request. Hence, with Claim 1, the entire topology information is not retrieved in response to the first request for a graph. When a subsequent request is made for plotting a different portion of the same topology, not a different view of the same topology graph, than was previously displayed, then is the portion of the topology information necessary for plotting the newly requested portion of the topology retrieved from the source.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has questions regarding this case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortages in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully Submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG &
BECKER LLP

Date: 7/5/05

John D. Henkhaus
John D. Henkhaus
Reg. No. 42,656

(408) 414-1080, Ext. 203
Fax: (408) 414-1076
2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 5, 2005

by Darci Sakamoto
Darci Sakamoto

Ser. No. 09/905,306—Goldschmidt
GAU 2672 (M. Good-Johnson)
Attorney Docket No. 50325-0552